UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/758,969	01/15/2004	Armin G. Ebrahimi	12729-35	6514

56020 7590 05/31/2007

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE / YAHOO! OVERTURE
P.O. BOX 10395
CHICAGO, IL 60610

EXAMINER	
HUTTON JR, WILLIAM D	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2176	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
05/31/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/758,969	EBRAHIMI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Doug Hutton	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *12 March 2007*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *51-55,57-66,68,70-88,90-98 and 101-111* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *51-55,57-66,68,70-88,90-98,102,104-107 and 109-111* is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) *101,103 and 108* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *15 January 2004* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

Applicant's Response

In Applicant's Response dated 03/12/2007, Applicant amended Claims 51, 52, 54, 55, 62, 77, 78, 83, 90-98 and 101, added new Claims 102-111, cancelled Claims 99 and 100, and argued against all objections and rejections previously set forth in the Office Action dated 12/14/2006.

Based on the amendments to the claims, the objections to Claims 51, 62, 77, 90, 95, 96 and 98 previously set forth are withdrawn.

Based on the amendments to the claims, the rejections for Claims 90-98 and 101 under 35 U.S.C. 101 previously set forth are withdrawn.

Based on the amendments to the claims and Applicant's arguments, the rejections for Claims 51-55, 57-66, 68, 70-88 and 90-101 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first and second paragraphs, are withdrawn.

Claim Objections

Claim 90 is objected to because of the following informalities:

- The phrase "*In a computer readable medium*" in Line 1 should be amended to — [[In a]]A computer readable medium — because the "*computer readable medium*" **is** the invention.
- The phrase "*selecting a subset of the candidate components for placement on the web page as the page components*" in Lines 15-16 should be amended to — selecting a subset of the candidate components for placement onto the web page

as [[the]]page components — so that it is clear that "*page components*" that **are** placed onto the web page and "*page components*" that **are not** placed onto the web page are clearly distinguished.

Claims 92-94 are objected to because of the following informalities:

- In Claim 92, the phrase "*based on the relevance of each candidate component*" in Lines 4-5 should be amended to — based on [[the]]a relevance of each candidate component — because no "*relevance*" is previously mentioned in the claims. Claims 93 and 94 have the same problem.

Claims 104 and 109 are objected to because of the following informalities:

- In Claim 104, the phrase "*is equal to the relevancy of the respective page component*" should be amended to — is equal to the relevancy of the respective page component to the request — in order to indicate to what the "*page component*" is relevant. Claim 109 has the same problem.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 51-55, 57-66, 68, 70-88, 90-98, 102, 104-107 and 109-111 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kamangar et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2003/0046161 (hereinafter, "Kamangar"), in view of McElfresh et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2003/0149938 (hereinafter, "McElfresh").

Claim 51:

Kamangar discloses *a method for building a web page comprising:*

- *receiving a request from a user;*
- *dynamically composing a web page in response to the request; and*
- *making the web page available to the user,*

wherein the step of dynamically composing a web page comprises:

- *identifying a set of candidate components for the web page, each candidate component in the set of candidate components having a nominal value* (see Page 4, Paragraph 0040, second and third sentences → Kamangar discloses this limitation in that the system obtains a list of candidate ads based on performance parameters for each of the candidate ads);

- *selecting a subset of the candidate components for placement onto the web page as page components* (see Page 5, Paragraph 0049, first and second sentences → Kamangar discloses this limitation in that the system returns the highest scoring ads for display on the web page), *wherein the selecting is determined by an optimization of an actual page value of the web page* (see Page 1, Paragraph 0012, first sentence → Kamangar discloses this limitation in that the system maximizes the economic values of the ads displayed on the web page),

further wherein the actual page value of the web page is a function of a respective actual value of each respective page component placed on the web page (see Page 4, Paragraph 0043, second and third sentences → Kamangar discloses this limitation in that the system returns the ads with the highest scores to the web page), *and wherein the actual value of each respective page component placed on the web page is determined by a nominal value of the respective page component and an effectiveness of the respective page component on the web page* (see Page 4, Paragraph 0040, fifth sentence; see Page 4, Paragraph 0044, last sentence; see Page 5, Paragraph 0048, second and third sentences; see Page 5, Paragraph 0049, last sentence; see page 5, Paragraph 0050, second through fourth sentences → Kamangar discloses this limitation in that the system considers many different factors in calculating the scores for the returned ads, such as those discussed in the cited text), *wherein the effectiveness of the page component is based on a clutter of the web page*

(see Pages 2 and 3, Paragraph 0028; see Page 4, Paragraph 0040 → Kamangar discloses this limitation in that the system selects ads for display on the web pages based on many different factors including the amount of page space occupied by search results, the size and shape of the ads, a measure of user interest for an ad weighted for a size of the ad relative to that of other ads appearing on the web page, a measure of user interest for the ad weighted for past positions of the ad relative to those past positions of other ads appearing on the web page, expected user interest in the ad, a time needed to render the ad relative to that needed to render other ads appearing on the web page, etc.).

Kamangar fails to expressly disclose:

- *identifying a set of candidate components used in a **default composition** of the web page* (emphasis added);
- *placing the subset of the candidate components onto the web page as page components; and*
- *eliminating page components used in the default composition of the web page when such elimination increases the actual page value of the web page.*

McElfresh teaches:

- *identifying one or more page components used in a default composition of the web page;*

- *placing the subset of the candidate components onto the web page as page components; and*
- *eliminating a page components used in the default composition of the web page when such elimination increases the actual page value of the web page* (see Figures 1 and 2; see Page 3, Paragraphs 0031-0033 → McElfresh discloses these limitations in that the system replaces the web page title block with the highest scoring ad),

for the purpose of optimizing revenues generated by a web page (see Page 3, Paragraph 0031).

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method, disclosed in Kamangar, to include:

- *identifying one or more page components used in a default composition of the web page;*
- *placing the subset of the candidate components onto the web page as page components; and*
- *eliminating a page components used in the default composition of the web page when such elimination increases the actual page value of the web page,*

for the purpose of optimizing revenues generated by a web page, as taught by McElfresh.

Claim 52:

Kamangar fails to expressly disclose that:

- *the respective actual value of each respective page component placed on the web page is in a common unit of measure.*

McElfresh teaches that:

- *the respective actual value of each respective page component placed on the web page is in a common unit of measure* (see Page 4, Paragraph 0039, last sentence; see Page 4, Paragraph 0043, last sentence → McElfresh teaches this limitation in that the ranks the delivered set of ads according to calculations for the ads),

for the purpose of optimizing revenues generated by a web page (see Page 3, Paragraph 0031).

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method, disclosed in Kamangar, to include that:

- *the respective actual value of each respective page component placed on the web page is in a common unit of measure,*

for the purpose of optimizing revenues generated by a web page, as taught by McElfresh.

Claim 53:

Kamangar fails to expressly disclose that:

- *the step of receiving a request from a user comprises receiving the request via a browser.*

McElfresh teaches that:

- *the step of receiving a request from a user comprises receiving the request via a browser* (see Page 5, Paragraph 0050, first and second sentences → McElfresh teaches this limitation, as clearly indicated in the cited text),

for the purpose of optimizing revenues generated by a web page (see Page 3, Paragraph 0031).

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method, disclosed in Kamangar, to include that:

- *the step of receiving a request from a user comprises receiving the request via a browser,*

for the purpose of optimizing revenues generated by a web page, as taught by McElfresh.

Claim 54:

Kamangar discloses that:

- *the subset of candidate components includes one or more of a content page component, a link page component, and an advertisement page component.*

Claim 55:

Kamangar fails to expressly disclose that:

- *the actual page value equals a sum of the actual values of the page components on the web page, and*
- *the respective actual value of each respective page component on the web page equals the nominal value of the respective page component multiplied by the effectiveness of the respective page component on the web page.*

McElfresh teaches that:

- *the actual page value equals a sum of the actual values of the page components on the web page* (McElfresh teaches this limitation in that the value for the web page equals a sum of the values of the ads displayed on the web page), *and*
- *the respective actual value of each respective page component on the web page equals the nominal value of the respective page component multiplied by the effectiveness of the respective page component on the web page* (McElfresh

teaches this limitation in that the value of each ad displayed on the web page is determined using the characteristics of a user and the performance stats),

for the purpose of optimizing revenues generated by a web page (see Page 3, Paragraph 0031).

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method, disclosed in Kamangar, to include that:

- *the actual page value equals a sum of the actual values of the page components on the web page, and*
- *the respective actual value of each respective page component on the web page equals the nominal value of the respective page component multiplied by the effectiveness of the respective page component on the web page,*

for the purpose of optimizing revenues generated by a web page, as taught by McElfresh.

Claim 57:

Kamangar discloses:

- *determining a nominal value of a candidate component in said subset of the candidate components,*

wherein the candidate component is an advertisement page component, and the determining is based on a revenue generated by placement of the advertisement page component on the web page (see Page 4, Paragraph 0040, second and third sentences → Kamangar discloses this limitation in that the system obtains a list of candidate ads based on performance parameters for each of the candidate ads).

Claim 58:

Kamangar discloses:

- *determining a nominal value of a candidate component in said subset of the candidate components based on a relevancy of the candidate component to the request* (see Page 4, Paragraph 0041 → Kamangar discloses this limitation in that the performance parameters of the ads may be keyword-dependent).

Claim 59:

Kamangar discloses that:

- *the request was generated by a requesting web page* (see Page 2, Paragraph 0025, second and fourth sentences → Kamangar discloses this limitation in that the system comprises a content server that submits requests for ads), *and*
- *the step of determining a nominal value of the candidate component as a function of a relevancy of the candidate component to the request comprises*

determining a nominal value of the candidate component based on a relevancy of the candidate component to the requesting web page (see Page 3, Paragraph 0033, fifth sentence → Kamangar discloses this limitation in that the system comprises ad serving operations that may use relevancy determination operations to determine candidate ads for the request).

Claim 60:

Kamangar fails to expressly disclose that:

- *the candidate component is a content candidate component.*

McElfresh teaches that:

- *the candidate component is a content candidate component* (see Pages 1-2, Paragraph 0011, last sentence → McElfresh discloses this limitation in that the system also may be used to select topic tiles),

for the purpose of optimizing revenues generated by a web page (see Page 3, Paragraph 0031).

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method, disclosed in Kamangar, to include that:

- *the candidate component is a content candidate component.*

for the purpose of optimizing revenues generated by a web page, as taught by McElfresh.

Claim 61:

Kamangar discloses that:

- *the step of determining a nominal value of the candidate component comprises determining a nominal value of the candidate component based on a relevance of the candidate component to a demographic profile of the user* (see Page 3, Paragraph 0035 → Kamangar discloses this limitation in that the system comprises a centralized database that stores personal information about users).

Claim 62:

Kamangar discloses that:

- *the step of determining a nominal value of the candidate component comprises determining a nominal value of the candidate component based on a geographic location of the user* (see Page 3, Paragraph 0035, fourth sentence → Kamangar discloses this limitation in that the system comprises a centralized database that stores zip codes of users).

Claim 63:

Kamangar discloses that:

- *the step of determining a nominal value of the candidate component comprises determining a nominal value of the candidate component based on a relevance of the candidate component to a behavioral profile of the user* (see Page 4, Paragraph 0040, third sentence → Kamangar discloses this limitation in that the system comprises a performance database that stores performance information for the ads).

Claim 65:

Kamangar discloses:

- *tracking user follow-through on the web page* (see Page 4, Paragraph 0040, fifth and sixth sentences; see Page 4, Paragraph 0042 → Kamangar discloses this limitation in that the system stores time-weighted performance data of the ads); *and*
- *updating the nominal value of a page component on the web page in response to the tracking* (see Page 4, Paragraph 0040, fifth and sixth sentences; see Page 4, Paragraph 0042 → Kamangar discloses this limitation in that the system uses the time-weighted performance data to identify the candidate ads).

Claim 66:

Kamangar discloses that:

- *the step of tracking user follow-through on the web page comprises tracking link follow-through on the web page* (see Page 4, Paragraph 0040, fifth and sixth sentences; see Page 4, Paragraph 0042 → Kamangar discloses this limitation in that the system stores click-through data for the ads).

Claim 68:

Kamangar discloses that:

- *the effectiveness of the page component is based on the identity of another page component on the web page* (see Page 4, Paragraph 0040, fifth sentence; see Page 5, Paragraph 0048; see Page 5, Paragraph 0050 → Kamangar discloses this limitation in that the performance parameters comprise a measure of user interest for an ad weighted for: 1) a size of the ad relative to other ads, and 2) past positions of the ad relative to the past positions of other ads. Also, the system can modify scores of ads in order to take "unique information" into account and adjust scores for new or low ranking ads, as indicated in the cited text. These actions affect the ads selected for display on the web page.).

Claim 72:

Kamangar fails to expressly disclose that:

- *the step of dynamically composing a web page in response to the request comprises:*
    - *using a static composition for a portion of the web page; and*
    - *dynamically composing a remainder of the web page in response to the request.*

McElfresh teaches that:

- *the step of dynamically composing a web page in response to the request comprises:*
    - *using a static composition for a portion of the web page; and*
    - *dynamically composing a remainder of the web page in response to the request,*

for the purpose of optimizing revenues generated by a web page (see Page 3, Paragraph 0031).

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method, disclosed in Kamangar, to include that:

- *the step of dynamically composing a web page in response to the request comprises:*

- *using a static composition for a portion of the web page; and*
- *dynamically composing a remainder of the web page in response to the request,*

for the purpose of optimizing revenues generated by a web page, as taught by McElfresh.

Claim 73:

Kamangar fails to expressly disclose that:

- *the request uniquely identifies a web page.*

McElfresh teaches that:

- *the request uniquely identifies a web page,*

for the purpose of optimizing revenues generated by a web page (see Page 3, Paragraph 0031).

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method, disclosed in Kamangar, to include that:

- *the request uniquely identifies a web page,*

for the purpose of optimizing revenues generated by a web page, as taught by McElfresh.

Claim 74:

Kamangar discloses that:

- *the request comprises a search request.*

Claim 75:

Kamangar fails to expressly disclose that:

- *the step of making the web page available to the user comprises transmitting the web page to the user.*

McElfresh teaches that:

- *the step of making the web page available to the user comprises transmitting the web page to the user,*

for the purpose of optimizing revenues generated by a web page (see Page 3, Paragraph 0031).

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method, disclosed in Kamangar, to include that:

- *the step of making the web page available to the user comprises transmitting the web page to the user,*

for the purpose of optimizing revenues generated by a web page, as taught by McElfresh.

Claim 76:

Kamangar fails to expressly disclose that:

- *the step of receiving a request from a user comprises receiving a request from the user via the Internet,*
- *the step of dynamically composing a web page in response to the request comprises dynamically composing a web page in response to the request, and*
- *the step of making the web page available to the user comprises transmitting the web page to the user via the Internet.*

McElfresh teaches that:

- *the step of receiving a request from a user comprises receiving a request from the user via the Internet,*
- *the step of dynamically composing a web page in response to the request comprises dynamically composing a web page in response to the request, and*
- *the step of making the web page available to the user comprises transmitting the web page to the user via the Internet,*

for the purpose of optimizing revenues generated by a web page (see Page 3, Paragraph 0031).

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method, disclosed in Kamangar, to include that:

- *the step of receiving a request from a user comprises receiving a request from the user via the Internet,*
- *the step of dynamically composing a web page in response to the request comprises dynamically composing a web page in response to the request, and*
- *the step of making the web page available to the user comprises transmitting the web page to the user via the Internet,*

for the purpose of optimizing revenues generated by a web page, as taught by McElfresh.

Claim 77:

The majority of the recited limitations in Claim 77 corresponds to the subject matter recited in Claim 51. Thus, Kamangar, in view of McElfresh, disclose/teach these limitations of Claim 77, as indicated in the above rejection for Claim 51.

Additionally, Kamangar discloses:

further wherein the effectiveness increases when the page component has a synergistic effect with another page component on the web page and the effectiveness decreases when the page component incurs distraction from another page component on the web

page (see Page 4, Paragraph 0040, fifth sentence; see Page 4, Paragraph 0044, last sentence; see Page 5, Paragraph 0048, second and third sentences; see Page 5, Paragraph 0049, last sentence; see page 5, Paragraph 0050, second through fourth sentences → Kamangar discloses this limitation in that the system considers many different factors in calculating the scores for the candidate ads, such as those discussed in the cited text. Moreover, as indicated in the above rejection for Claim 51, Kamangar discloses the consideration of the "*clutter*" of the web page when determining which ads to place onto the web page. The language recited in this claim limitation is simply another way of reciting the consideration of the "*clutter*" of the web page when determining which ads to place onto the web page).

Claim 78:

Kamangar discloses that:

- *the step of receiving the request from a user comprises receiving a request from a web server on behalf of a browser operated by the user* (as indicated in the above rejection of Claim 53, Kamangar discloses this limitation), *and*
- *the step of making the web page available to the user comprises identifying the web page to the web server for communication of the web page to the browser operated by the user* (Kamangar discloses this limitation in that the system displays the web page to the user).

Claim 79:

Kamangar discloses that:

- *the received information comprises a category for classifying a page component in said plurality of page components* (see Page 2, Paragraph 0025, last sentence; see Page 3, Paragraph 0030 → Kamangar discloses this limitation in that the system categorizes content requests submitted by users and matches ads accordingly), *and*
- *the step of identifying a set of candidate components from the database of page components comprises identifying the candidate component based at least in part on the category of each page component in the database of page components* (see Page 2, Paragraph 0025, last sentence; see Page 3, Paragraph 0030 → Kamangar discloses this limitation in that the system categorizes content requests submitted by users and matches ads accordingly).

Claim 82:

Kamangar discloses that:

- *for each page component in at least a portion of the page components in the plurality of page components, the received information comprises relevant date information for the page component* (see Page 2, Paragraph 0026, last sentence → Kamangar discloses this limitation in that the system transmits information concerning impression time and impression data).

Claim 83:

Kamangar discloses that:

- *the received information comprises a target demographic for each page component in the plurality of page components, and*
- *the nominal value for each page component is based on a match between the target demographic and a demographic profile of the user* (see Page 3, Paragraph 0030, third sentence → Kamangar discloses this limitation in that the system demographically targets ads. Additionally, the programmer responsible for creating/maintaining the ad-serving operations may set up/adjust the ad-selection criteria to target a particular demographic.).

Claim 84:

Kamangar discloses that:

- *the received information comprises a subject matter descriptor for a first page component in the plurality of page components, and*
- *the step of identifying a set of candidate components from the database of page components comprises identifying the first page component based at least in part on the subject matter descriptor for the first page component* (see Page 3, Paragraph 0032, third sentence → Kamangar discloses this limitation in that the system comprises a search engine that matches ads with search results based on the search criteria entered by the user).

Claim 85:

Kamangar discloses that:

- *the subject matter descriptor comprises a keyword* (see Page 3, Paragraph 0032, third sentence → Kamangar discloses this limitation in that the system comprises a search engine that matches ads with search results based on the search criteria entered by the user).

Claim 86:

As indicated in the above rejection, Kamangar, in view of McElfresh, disclose/teach every limitation of Claim 77.

Kamangar, in view of McElfresh, fails to expressly disclose/teach that:

- *the received information is in a format based on a predefined template.*

However, the examiner takes **Official Notice** that it was well-known to one of ordinary skill in the art (e.g., a computer programmer who writes code for webcrawlers) at the time the invention was made to design a webcrawler that uses a "*format based on a predefined template*" to collect information about web page components. The "*format based on a predefined template*" allows the webcrawler software to index the web page components more efficiently. The system disclosed in Kamangar comprises a search engine and is thus combinable with webcrawler technology.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method, disclosed/taught in Kamangar, in view of McElfresh, to include that:

- *the received information is in a format based on a predefined template,*

for the purpose of facilitating the indexing of the crawled web page components.

The examiner also takes **Official Notice** that it was well-known to one of ordinary skill in the art (e.g., a computer programmer who writes code for data entry) at the time the invention was made to design a data entry software module that uses a "*format based on a predefined template*" to collect data from users. The recited claim language, "*format based on a predefined template*," reads on data entry forms, which facilitate data entry by presenting a user-friendly interface to the user. The system disclosed in Kamangar allows user to enter data into the system and is thus combinable with data entry technology.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method, disclosed/taught in Kamangar, in view of McElfresh, to include that:

- *the received information is in a format based on a predefined template,*

for the purpose of facilitating data entry.

Claim 87:

Kamangar discloses that:

- *the received information is received via a predefined application program interface* (see Page 3, Paragraph 0030, fourth sentence → Kamangar discloses this limitation in that the system allows advertisers to interface with the system).

Claim 88:

As indicated in the above rejection, Kamangar, in view of McElfresh, disclose/teach every limitation of Claim 77.

Kamangar, in view of McElfresh, fails to expressly disclose/teach that:

- *the step of receiving information describing the plurality of page components comprises:*
  - *crawling through a network of web pages; and*
  - *generating information describing the plurality of page components within the network of web pages.*

However, the examiner takes **Official Notice** that it was well-known to one of ordinary skill in the art (e.g., a computer programmer who writes code for in the areas of search engines and indexed databases) at the time the invention was made to use a webcrawler to populate a database with relevant data and generate information

describing the data. The "*information describing*" the crawled data (e.g., web page components) allows the webcrawler software to index the data so that a user may subsequently search the data more efficiently. The system disclosed in Kamangar comprises a search engine and is thus combinable with webcrawler technology.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method, disclosed/taught in Kamangar, in view of McElfresh, to include that:

receiving information describing the plurality of page components [that] comprises:

- *the step of receiving information describing the plurality of page components comprises:*
  - *crawling through a network of web pages; and*
  - *generating information describing the plurality of page components within the network of web pages,*

for the purpose of facilitating the indexing of the crawled data so that a user may subsequently search the data more efficiently.

Claims 90-97:

Claims 90-97 merely recite a computer system that performs the methods of Claims 51, 55, 58, 61, 63, 65, 68 and 77, respectively. The systems disclosed/taught in

Kamangar and McElfresh operate via computer systems. Thus, Kamangar, in view of McElfresh, disclose/teach every limitation of Claims 90-97, as indicated in the above rejections for Claims 51, 55, 58, 61, 63, 65, 68 and 77.

Claim 98:

Kamangar discloses:

- *instructions operative to communicating a candidate component registration change* (see Page 3, Paragraph 0030, fourth sentence; see Page 5, Paragraph 0048 → Kamangar discloses this limitation in that the system allows advertisers to modify variables used to determine scores for ads. Additionally, the programmer responsible for creating/maintaining the ad-serving operation may set up/adjust the ad-selection criteria to target a particular demographic.).

Claim 102:

Kamangar discloses that:

- *the effectiveness of each respective page component is equal to the clutter of the web page* (see Pages 2 and 3, Paragraph 0028; see Page 4, Paragraph 0040 → Kamangar discloses this limitation in that the system selects ads for display on the web pages based on many different factors including the amount of page space occupied by search results, the size and shape of the ads, a measure of

user interest for an ad weighted for a size of the ad relative to that of other ads appearing on the web page, a measure of user interest for the ad weighted for past positions of the ad relative to those past positions of other ads appearing on the web page, expected user interest in the ad, a time needed to render the ad relative to that needed to render other ads appearing on the web page, etc.).

Claim 104:

Kamangar discloses that:

- *the nominal value of each respective page component is equal to the relevancy of the respective page component* (see Page 4, Paragraph 0041 → Kamangar discloses these limitations in that the performance parameters of the ads may be keyword-dependent).

Claim 105:

Kamangar discloses that:

- *the relevancy of a respective page value is provided by a third party application* (see Page 3, Paragraph 0030, fourth sentence; see Page 5, Paragraph 0048 → Kamangar discloses this limitation in that the system allows advertisers to modify variables used to determine scores for ads. Additionally, the programmer

responsible for creating/maintaining the ad-serving operation may set up/adjust the ad-selection criteria to target a particular demographic.).

Claim 106:

Kamangar discloses that:

- *the nominal value of each respective page component is assigned by a provider of the component* (see Page 3, Paragraph 0030, fourth sentence; see Page 5, Paragraph 0048 → Kamangar discloses this limitation in that the system allows advertisers to modify variables used to determine scores for ads. Additionally, the programmer responsible for creating/maintaining the ad-serving operation may set up/adjust the ad-selection criteria to target a particular demographic.).

Claims 107 and 109-111:

Claims 107 and 109-111 correspond to the subject matter recited in Claims 102 and 104-106, respectively. Thus, Kamangar, in view of McElfresh, disclose/teach these limitations of Claims 107 and 109-111, as indicated in the above rejection for Claims 102 and 104-106.

Claims 64, 70 and 80 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kamangar, in view of McElfresh, and further in view of Aggarwal et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,714,975 (hereinafter, Aggarwal).

Claim 64:

As indicated in the above rejection, Kamangar, in view of McElfresh, discloses/teaches every limitation of Claim 58.

Kamangar, in view of McElfresh, fails to expressly disclose/teach that:

- *the candidate component has a plurality of versions, and*
- *the step of determining a nominal value of the candidate component comprises determining a nominal value of the candidate component based on the version of the candidate component placed on the web page.*

Aggarwal teaches *a method for building a web page* (see Column 1, Lines 9-12 → Aggarwal teaches this limitation, as clearly indicated in the cited text), *comprising:*

- *identifying a candidate component [that] has a plurality of versions* (see Column 5, Lines 29-31; see Column 8, Lines 35-37 → Aggarwal teaches this limitation in that the system comprises a self-learning analyzer that takes into account different versions of an ad)*; and*
- *determining a nominal value of the candidate component [that] comprises determining a nominal value of the candidate component based on the version of the candidate component placed on the web page* (see Column 9, Lines 16-32 →

Aggarwal teaches this limitation in that the system assigns ads to web pages according to client characteristics and self-learned data),

for the purpose of dynamically assigning advertisements to appropriate slots on appropriate web pages based on a characteristic of the requesting client (see Column 2, Lines 33-38).

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method, disclosed/taught in Kamangar, in view of McElfresh, to include that:

- *the candidate component has a plurality of versions, and*
- *the step of determining a nominal value of the candidate component comprises determining a nominal value of the candidate component based on the version of the candidate component placed on the web page,*

for the purpose of dynamically assigning advertisements to appropriate slots on appropriate web pages based on a characteristic of the requesting client, as taught by Aggarwal.

Claim 70:

As indicated in the above rejection, Kamangar, in view of McElfresh, discloses/teaches every limitation of Claim 58.

Kamangar, in view of McElfresh, fails to expressly disclose/teach:

- *for at least one page component, selecting a version of the page component.*

Aggarwal teaches *a method for building a web page* (see Column 1, Lines 9-12 → Aggarwal teaches this limitation, as clearly indicated in the cited text), *comprising:*

- *selecting a subset of the candidate components for placement on the web page as page components,*

wherein the selecting comprises, for at least one page component, selecting a version of the page component (see Column 5, Lines 29-31; see Column 8, Lines 35-37; see Column 9, Lines 16-32 → Aggarwal teaches this limitation in that the system comprises a self-learning analyzer that takes into account different versions of an ad and assigns the ads to web pages according to client characteristics and self-learned data), for the purpose of dynamically assigning advertisements to appropriate slots on appropriate web pages based on a characteristic of the requesting client (see Column 2, Lines 33-38).

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method, disclosed/taught in Kamangar, in view of McElfresh, to include:

- *for at least one page component, selecting a version of the page component,*

for the purpose of dynamically assigning advertisements to appropriate slots on appropriate web pages based on a characteristic of the requesting client, as taught by Aggarwal.

Claim 80:

Claim 80 corresponds to the subject matter recited in Claims 64 and 70. Thus, Kamangar, in view of McElfresh, and further in view of Aggarwal, disclose/teach every limitation of Claim 80, as indicated in the above rejections for Claims 64 and 70.

Claim 71 and 81 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kamangar, in view of McElfresh and Aggarwal, and further in view of Llach, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2004/0186776 (hereinafter, Llach).

Claim 71:

As indicated in the above rejection, Kamangar, in view of McElfresh and Aggarwal, discloses/teaches every limitation of Claim 70.

Kamangar, in view of McElfresh and Aggarwal, fails to expressly disclose/teach that:

- *the step of selecting a version of the page component is based on an available bandwidth for the user.*

Llach teaches *a method for building a web page* (see Figures 2 and 3; see Page 1, Paragraph 0009 → Llach teaches this limitation, as clearly indicated in the cited figures and text), *comprising:*

- *selecting a version of a page component,*

wherein the selecting is based on an available bandwidth for the user (see Page 2, Paragraph 0021; see Page 3, Paragraphs 0026 and 0029 → Llach teaches these limitations in that the system selects ads for a variety of media, including personal computers, mobile telephones and PDAs),
for the purpose of maximizing advertising revenue (see Page 1, Paragraph 0006).

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method, disclosed/taught in Kamangar, in view of McElfresh and Aggarwal, to include that:

- *the step of selecting a version of the page component is based on an available bandwidth for the user,*

for the purpose of maximizing advertising revenue, as taught by Llach.

Claim 81:

Claim 81 corresponds to the subject matter recited in Claim 71. Thus, Kamangar, in view of McElfresh, further in view of Aggarwal, and further in view of Llach

disclose/teach every limitation of Claim 81, as indicated in the above rejection for Claim 71.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 101, 103 and 108 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

Claims 101, 103 and 108:

The prior art fails to disclose or suggest a method of building a web page comprising the combination of limitations recited in the claims.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 03/12/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103 (Claims 51, 77 and 90):

Applicant argues that McElfresh does not show adding page components to the page and eliminating page components from the page when the elimination increases the actual page value of the page. See *Response* – Page 17, second full paragraph, last sentence.

The examiner disagrees.

Firstly, the examiner notes that Claim 90 does not recite the argued limitations.

Secondly, the system in McElfresh requests and obtains possible ads and/or content material based upon various information, such as user information, demographic information, time of day, etc. The system then ranks the ads according to various arrangement methods including click-through percentage for the ads and click-through percentage multiplied by the price-per-click for the ads. The rankings include lists of possible assignments of ads to particular ad spots and are sorted in descending order of expected revenue.

The lists of possible assignments of ads to particular ad spots in the requested web page are the equivalent of the recited "*placing the subset of the candidate components onto the web page as page components*" (see Claim 51, Lines 12-13).

Subsequently, the system in McElfresh fills available ad spots on the requested web page so that the web page is optimized for increased click-throughs and/or increased revenue generation. Therefore, only the ads that increase the value of the web page are used in the display of the requested web page and all other ads are eliminated from the web page.

The eliminations of those listed ads that are not displayed on the web page is the equivalent of "*eliminating page components from the web page when such elimination increases the actual page value of the web page*" (see Claim 51, Lines 14-16).

Accordingly, Kamangar, in view of McElfresh, discloses/teaches every limitation of Claims 51, 77 and 90.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Doug Hutton whose telephone number is 571-272-4137. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon, can be reached at (571) 272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-2100.

WDH
May 29, 2007

/Doug Hutton/
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2176